

United States District Court

For the Northern District of California

1
2
3
4
5
6 BIOTECHNOLOGY VALUE FUND, L.P.,
7 BIOTECHNOLOGY VALUE FUND II,
8 L.P., INVESTMENT 10, L.L.C., BVF
9 INVESTMENTS, L.L.C.; BVF INC., and
10 BVF X, LLC,

No. C 13-03248 WHA

11 Plaintiffs,

**ORDER APPROVING
STIPULATED PROTECTIVE
ORDER SUBJECT TO
STATED CONDITIONS**

12 v.

13 CELERA CORPORATION, QUEST
14 DIAGNOSTICS INCORPORATED,
15 CREDIT SUISSES SECURITIES (USA)
16 LLC, KATHY ORDOÑEZ, RICHARD H.
17 AYERS, JEAN-LUC BELINGARD,
18 WILLIAM G. GREEN, PETER BARTON
19 HUTT, GAIL M. NAUGHTON, WAYNE
I.. ROE, and BENNETT M. SHAPIRO,

Defendants.

20 _____ /
21
22 The stipulated protective order submitted by the parties is hereby **APPROVED**, subject to
23 the following conditions, including adherence to the Ninth Circuit's strict caution against
24 sealing orders (as set out below):

25 1. The parties must make a good-faith determination that any
26 information designated "confidential" truly warrants protection under Rule 26(c)
27 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Designations of material as
28 "confidential" must be narrowly tailored to include only material for which there
is good cause. A pattern of over-designation may lead to an order un-designating
all or most materials on a wholesale basis.

1 2. In order to be treated as confidential, any materials filed with the
2 Court must be lodged with a request for filing under seal in compliance with Civil
3 Local Rule 79-5. Please limit your requests for sealing to only those narrowly
4 tailored portions of materials for which good cause to seal exists. Please include
5 all other portions of your materials in the public file and clearly indicate therein
6 where material has been redacted and sealed. Each filing requires an
7 individualized sealing order; blanket prospective authorizations are no longer
8 allowed by Civil Local Rule 79-5.

9 3. Chambers copies should include all material — both redacted and
10 unredacted — so that chambers staff does not have to reassemble the whole brief
11 or declaration. Although chambers copies should clearly designate which
12 portions are confidential, chambers copies with confidential materials will be
13 handled like all other chambers copies of materials without special restriction, and
14 will typically be recycled, not shredded.

15 4. In *Kamakana v. Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir. 2006),
16 the Ninth Circuit held that *more* than good cause, indeed, “compelling reasons”
17 are required to seal documents used in dispositive motions, just as compelling
18 reasons would be needed to justify a closure of a courtroom during trial.
19 Otherwise, the Ninth Circuit held, public access to the work of the courts will be
20 unduly compromised. Therefore, no request for a sealing order will be allowed
21 on summary judgment motions (or other dispositive motions) unless the movant
22 first shows a “compelling reason,” a substantially higher standard than “good
23 cause.” This will be true regardless of any stipulation by the parties. *Counsel are*
24 *warned that most summary judgment motions and supporting material should be*
25 *completely open to public view.* Only social security numbers, names of
26 juveniles, home addresses and phone numbers, and trade secrets of a compelling
27 nature (like the recipe for Coca Cola, for example) will qualify. If the courtroom
28 would not be closed for the information, nor should any summary judgment

1 proceedings, which are, in effect, a substitute for trial. Motions *in limine* are also
2 part of the trial and must likewise be laid bare absent compelling reasons. Please
3 comply fully. Noncompliant submissions are liable to be stricken in
4 their entirety.

5 5. Any confidential materials used openly in court hearings or trial
6 will not be treated in any special manner absent a further order.

7 6. This order does not preclude any party from moving to
8 undesignate information or documents that have been designated as confidential.
9 The party seeking to designate material as confidential has the burden of
10 establishing that the material is entitled to protection.

11 7. The Court will retain jurisdiction over disputes arising from the
12 proposed and stipulated protective order for only **NINETY DAYS** after final
13 termination of the action.

14
15 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16
17 Dated: November 12, 2013.

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28


WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE